

Social Questions Bulletin

June 46

MAY, 1956

Number 5

1956 MFSA Meeting Success

With addresses by its President and Secretaries; by Dr. Clair who directs the Religion & Labor Foundation and wrote Social Action Handbook for our Board of Social and Economic Relations; by Bishops Edgar A. Love, John Wesley Lord, Gerald Ensley (who spoke on MFSA Presidents of yesterday Bishops Brooks, Hartman, and McConnell), and by Bishop Bell Booth (who spoke on Africa to over 200 attending the afternoon session in Wesley Methodist Church)—the MFSA Membership Meeting in Minneapolis, April 28-29, one of the most successful and widely attended in MFSA's half-century. Rev. Clarence T. R. Nelson, District Superintendent, led discussion on Methodist racial segregation, discussed in the last Bulletin. There were actions on pressing social issues and plans to increase Federation membership, support effectiveness. The Golden or Fiftieth Anniversary Membership Meeting was discussed, and is to be held next year, perhaps in Washington, D. C., where leading Methodists founded the Federation in 1907. Widely representative Executive and National Committee members were elected for later membership ballot confirmation. Dr. Loyd F. Worley was unanimously elected President along with the following supporting officers: **Presidents:** Rev. Frederick Ball of Ottawa, Illinois; Rev. Lee Ball, New York Conference Treasurer; Prof. George H. Collier, College of the Pacific; Rev. Clarence T. R. Nelson; Mrs. J. Phillips, and Rev. Dr. Elwin Wilson of Maine. **Recording Secretaries:** Mrs. Floyd Mulkey of Chicago and Miss Janice M. Peet. **Treasurer,** Rev. Edward Peet with Rev. Hillis Culver as assistant.

MFSA 1956 PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

By REV. DR. LOYD WORLEY

With an eye to religious groups, the Communists have used religious fronts such as the Methodist Federation for Social Action."

These words may be found printed on page 91 of "A Handbook for Americans," published December 21, 1955, by the committee to investigate the administration of the Internal Security Act and other internal security laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate.

The Methodist Federation was founded in 1907. On Thursday morning, April 26th of this session of the General Conference, the devotional address was delivered by Bishop Herbert Welch, one of the founders and the first President of the Federation.

In calling attention to these facts, the Federation is performing a function which no official spokesman or organization of the Church has done. The deliberate error and misrepresentation of the "Handbook" thus emanating from the subcommittee, headed by Senator Eastland, is of course obvious to those who know Bishop Herbert Welch, Dr. Worth M. Tippy, Harry F. Ward and Dr. Frank Mason North, to name a few of the founding fathers of the Federation. The Eastland "Handbook" itself does not date the organization of the Communist Party in the United States until 1919, over a decade after the Federation fellowship was organized. Is it any wonder that we question the accuracy of other so-called statements in the Eastland "Handbook?"

This is the same Senator Eastland, a Methodist, who is responsible for the

Continued on Page 19

The Methodist Federation for Social Action, an unofficial membership organization, founded in 1907, seeks to deepen within the Church, the sense of social obligation and opportunity to study, from the Christian point of view, social problems and their solutions and to promote social action in the spirit of Jesus. The Federation stands for the complete abolition of war. The Federation rejects the method of the struggle for profit as the economic base for society and seeks to replace it with social-economic planning to develop a society without class or group discriminations and privileges. In seeking these objectives, the Federation does not commit its members to any specific program, but remains an inspirational and educational agency, proposing social changes by democratic decisions, not by violence.

SOME RESOLUTIONS FROM THE 1956 MFSA MEMBERSHIP MEETING

We call again for the repeal of repressive legislation such as the Smith Act, the Internal Security Act of 1950, the Taft-Hartley Law, and all loyalty oaths on the national or local level which are not traditionally a part of our American system. We call also for the repeal of the Walter-McCarran Law of 1952 which is so unjust in its restrictions on immigrants and in its treatment of the rights of the foreign-born. We particularly condemn those sections that undermine the right of the naturalized citizen to be secure in his citizenship and those sections which provide for the deportation of non-citizens regardless of the length of time they have lived here, or the contribution they have made to the well-being of the nation. We note with satisfaction that the Supreme Court has agreed to review the case of Charles Rowoldt of Minneapolis and pray that the Court will be guided in its deliberations by the great traditions and ideals that have been and are a part of our basic concepts of "liberty and justice for all." (On this case and the Supreme Court decision to review, see separate statement—Editor.)

Aware of the possibility of grave injustice in interpreting the recent four to four decision of the Supreme Court in the case of David Hyun against the defendant, we call upon the Attorney General to exercise the discretionary powers granted his office and dismiss the deportation proceedings against Mr. Hyun of Los Angeles. (David's father was one of our beloved Methodist ministers in Korea. Bishop James C. Baker and other churchmen have vigorously opposed the government's deportation-persecution of David, who has criticized the Rhee regime—Editor.)

We note with great satisfaction the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Dr. Harry Slochower, associate professor, Brooklyn College, New York, as it affects the case of our secretary, Mrs. Jean Schuddakopf, and other Fifth Amendment supporters. We congratulate her on the heroic struggle she has been making. We extend to her our sincere best wishes and assure her and her good husband of our earnest prayers and hopes for complete and final vindication and victory. (We published this statement on May 20)

Continued on Page 20

MFSA TAKES HISTORIC ACTION

In the first legal action by a religious organization to restrain a congressional committee, Methodist Federation for Social Action on May 2 secured a temporary injunction from Washington's Judge Robert N. Wilkin against further printing and distribution of "Handbook for Americans," issued by the Eastland Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and absurdly describing MFSA as a "religious front formed by the Communists." In 1907, long before "the Communists" were organized, eminent Methodists formed the Federation and have led it ever since.

Judge Wilkin's ban was defied within the committee, countermanded by a judge of equal rank under pressure and later by a 2 to 1 Appeals Court decision, with a vigorous minority statement in our favor. We are asking the Supreme Court to review the case, and plan a fuller account in the next Bulletin.

MFSA MEMBERS MEET AT LAKE TAHOE, JULY 14-17

Again it's at the beautiful Methodist camp grounds, Skylandia, on Lake Tahoe, California. YOU are invited, whether from the emphasized western region or not.

MY FIGHT FOR ACADEMIC FREEDOM

By MRS. JEAN SCHUDDAKOPF

Two years ago, in May, 1954, I was summoned before the House Un-American Activities Committee. Those who have followed my case know that in the struggle carried on since that time, there have been several notable victories for civil liberties and academic freedom. First, after hearing me in six-hour session in July, 1954, the school board voted to retain me as school social worker in the Tacoma school system. Second, when the opposition forces succeeded in having the county school superintendent defy the school board and suspend me by virtue of a 40-year-old law, Mrs. Wanamaker (Washington State Superintendent of Schools and nationally recognized educator) held a day-long formal hearing in Olympia in December, 1955, and reversed the county superintendent's decision.

Mrs. Wanamaker supported the school board's decision to retain me and their right to make it. She held further that invoking the Fifth Amendment by a teacher did not in itself constitute grounds for dismissal. (Editor's note: The same position has now been taken by the U. S. Supreme Court in ordering reinstatement and back pay for New York City college professor Slochower, who had been dismissed simply for invoking the Fifth Amendment.) Third, in March, 1956, Mr. James Boze, Chairman of the Tacoma School Board which had voted to retain me, was re-elected to the Board. One of the principal planks in the opposition platform was Mr. Boze's support of me and of my position. Fourth, the judge who remanded the case to Mrs. Wanamaker as a political maneuver and a stall, is going to reconsider, and Mrs. Wanamaker, whose decision should have been final, has received further national recognition.

Despite these victories, I am still a teacher without a job when teachers are scarce, a social worker with no prospects for work when social workers are desperately needed. My salary for 1954-55 has not been paid, and the opposition's main purpose has been to revoke my certificate not only in Pierce County, but in the whole state of Washington. Nor have I been repaid for all the character vilification. So I keep on with the struggle.

While friends write to congratulate me on my supposed reinstatement, the prosecution announces its intention of taking the case to the Supreme Court. Actually, they do not wish it to go to the Supreme Court; that Court's decision in the Slochower case in April, restored Dr. Slochower to his teaching job and set a precedent for all similar cases, including mine.

In view of the clear Supreme Court decision and the fact that no one to date has accused me of ever teaching anything subversive, it should be unnecessary for me to engage in further litigation. This is time consuming and expensive, despite the modest fees of my counsel, Mr. MacDonald. Fees and costs to date have been met by my husband and a few friends and myself. But the issue is more than personal. That the attack on me is an attack on education is borne out by the Fulton Lewis attack on Mrs. Wanamaker.

Of ultimate court victory there can be no doubt. Should I continue the court fight? Most friends of education and intellectual freedom demand an end to the continuing attack on educators whose sole "crime" is their refusal to conform and inform—lest, as I said two years ago, we shall soon have no schools worthy of the name. Do you agree? Do you know I am but one of a roster of dismissed teachers large enough to staff a school? (Editor's note: Even more tragic, perhaps, is the vast number of teachers silenced and intimidated by dismissal based not on teaching record or disqualifications, but on exercise of precious constitutional rights.) If you agree, you can help in two ways: 1. Send what funds you can for my legal expenses and get others to do the same. Checks may be made to me or to my lawyer, Kenneth MacDonald (and mailed to MFSA, Box 327, Gresham, Oregon—Editor). 2. Support Mrs. Wanamaker in every way you can in her campaign this fall.

Whatever you do about this will be important not only to me, but to teachers everywhere. So far, I have no formal committee of support or letterhead. Since I'm not threatened with jail, I guess it's not very romantic. Just being starved out never is.

"At the outset we must condemn the practice of imputing a sinister meaning to the exercise of a person's constitutional

right under the Fifth Amendment. The right of an accused person to refuse to testify, which had been in England merely a rule of evidence, was so important to our forefathers that they raised it to the dignity of a constitutional enactment and it has been recognized as 'one of the most valuable prerogatives of the citizen.' . . . The privilege against self-incrimination would be reduced to a hollow mockery if its exercise could be taken as equivalent either to a confession of guilt or a conclusive presumption of perjury. The privilege serves to protect the innocent who otherwise might be ensnared by ambiguous circumstances.—From the U. S. Supreme Court majority decision in *Ap* written by Justice Tom Clark(!) and ruling unconstitutional the 1952 dismissal of Brooklyn College professor, Dr. Harry S. Slochower.

"Perhaps from now on it will be a little more difficult to suspect people because they stand by the Constitution."—Statement by Dr. Harry Slochower after Supreme Court decision vindicating him.

"If this decision stands, it may be impossible for states to use their subdivisions to protect themselves from Communist infiltration and influence."—Comment on the same Court decision by Mississippi Senator Eastland.

WHAT THE HOUSE COMMITTEE REFUSED TO HEAR

By DR. WILLARD UPHAUS

(Editor's Note: Our fellow-Methodist and Federationist friend Willard Uphaus, was recently brought before the House Committee on Un-American Activities and harassed on the Committee's usual "guilt by association" principles. Willard exercised the free travel right to which our government pretends vigorous lip-service in the U. N. Declaration of Human Rights. The Committee refused to hear the prepared statement we prepared here.—Meanwhile, in his world brotherhood camp in Conway, N. H., Willard expects a quiet summer. He writes to me the witch hunt against him and others under that state's sedition law, was dropped after the Supreme Court [on April 22] in the Nelson case ruled all such state sedition laws unconstitutional.)

The subpoena brought to my home on May 10th to appear at a hearing before the House Un-American Activities Committee on May 23rd did not specify what the nature or subject matter of the investigation would be. The summons was given because of any act that I had committed against any person, my state or my country. I can only assume from the statement made by the Committee representative who served me that the Inquiry must be concerned with my private judgments and opinions, my association with people and organizations, and my travels abroad.

Any information that I might be able to give with respect to the enactment of proposed legislation or any counsel that would be of value to my country I would gladly have given voluntarily without the embarrassment and threats that go with an enforced summons.

1. The right of movement is inherent in human society. This right is set forth in the UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights. "Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and return to his country."

At present our government has set up unnecessary and dangerous passport restrictions as an instrument of the cold war. It has taken away the right of travel for many as a punishment for their political and economic views. The restrictions are part of the remnants of a narrow isolationism, an educational lag and a war against the intellect. Any country that erects barriers to prevent the free flow of friendship, ideas, culture and trade leads the world to war and not to peace.

2. My own activities and moral judgments grow out of my nurture in the Judaeo-Christian faith which began in childhood. As a teacher of religion in colleges and theological schools and as a worker for brotherhood, justice and peace, I have given special thought to the meaning, for our time, of the social and ethical teachings of the Hebrew prophets, of Jesus, and of other seers who have appeared in history. My beliefs, activities and associations stem from my religion and not from some other ideology.

Therefore, if and when I am in error in thought or behavior, having violated any state or federal statute, it is my personal responsibility, through prayer, study and counsel, to correct thinking and conduct, or it is the business of my church, Methodist Church, to instruct or discipline me; it is distinctly not the business of the government.

If the Un-American Activities Committee, through question- or other pressure, concerns itself with my conduct in accordance with my religious views, or seeks to make moral judgments about my views, it infringes on my free exercise of religion as guaranteed by the First Amendment, and it goes contrary to the Social Creed of The Methodist Church.

3. I hold that as a Christian, I have the right to choose whatever associates I desire, as long as the choices and associations are for the purpose of bringing peace and the abundant life to all people, or for the purpose of performing socially constructive acts. I have for years worked with persons of any race, faith, nationality or political conviction. Peace must be won through the free associations of those who have differences to solve. It is the responsibility of individual citizens to cross barriers of the mind and of geography, as well as it is the responsibility of the official representatives of governments.

The present practice, in and out of government, of exposing people or trying to repress and frighten them is both undemocratic and un-Christian. It violates the sacredness of the individual personality and poisons social and international relations. The Methodist Church is clear in its teaching on guilt by association. It condemns the techniques of

social rejection, calling names, demands of 'loyalty oaths', denial of employment, irresponsible accusations and assertion of 'guilt by association'. "In any of these cases the results are false and inadequate information, degradation of the human mind, and shackling of the human spirit. Such an atmosphere of suspicion becomes fear, fear becomes hatred, and hatred becomes war. Our role is not to suppress ideas, but to open channels of communication so that men can come to know the thoughts of their neighbors, and so that the best thoughts of all can come to be possessions of all mankind.

"Thou shalt not raise a false report; put not thine hand with the wicked to be an unrighteous witness." Exodus 23:1.

"Thou shalt not go up and down as a talebearer among thy people." Lev. 19:16.

"Be not a witness against thy neighbor without cause; and deceive not with thy lips." Prov. 24:28.

4. On Bill of Rights Day, December 15th, President Eisenhower said:

"By our Bill of Rights our people are guaranteed the most precious liberties: Freedom of speech, press and religion; the right peaceably to assemble and to petition the government; freedom from unreasonable search and seizure and the right of privacy. Citizens throughout our land find renewal in their hearts and minds devotion to those freedoms and determination to defend them against all attacks. Let us also highly recommit ourselves to continue to strive for a peaceful world in which all mankind share these freedoms."

This unwarranted invasion of my freedom puts me in double jeopardy. The State of New Hampshire gave me a contempt citation and a sentence because I refused to inform on people. I came to World Fellowship Conference Ground to enjoy religious freedom and discuss present-day problems in a peaceful and democratic way. Record of my religious background and convictions, my associations and activities, and the moral and legal grounds for resisting tyrannical government is all available to the Un-American Activities Committee. How often must a loyal citizen and a life-long Christian prove, under oath, that he is not going to commit violence or enter into associations that lead to violence. State federal representatives might better spend their time and taxpayers' money than by harrasing innocent people to make a headline or be elected to a public office.

SA 1956 PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

Continued from Page 17

mentioned in Time magazine (March 12, 1956) as saying that the Supreme Court "has been indoctrinated and brainwashed by left-wing pressure groups." The same source quotes him concerning groups working toward improved civil rights as "run from the top and red of the Communist party to the almost equally red of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U. S. A." Now who is ready to stand up to Senator Eastland and tell him he does not represent the best in American life, politics and churchmanship. Certainly this conservative General Confer-

ence will not do so. Yesterday it was unwilling to support religious freedom in terms of the First Amendment to the Constitution. If any effective backfire is to be started, it will evidently have to begin with some unofficial fellowship like the Methodist Federation for Social Action. Do I need to point out any better reason why we need the Federation? It is the Federation's function to raise issues for discussion and to trust the judgment of the democratic process to complete the operation. When official spokesmen and agencies take over, the Federation can move on to the next issue. This was the philosophy of action so well taught by Bishop McConnell through the years.

Naturally not all issues are as clear-cut and as easily comprehended as the Eastland case. Of course the Federation has undoubtedly made some mistakes of judgment, but these have been compensated in situations where the Federation has been the saving voice for human values and human welfare. The Federation, like our Master in Galilee, is interested in individual justice and service. It has shown this, for example, for two Methodist laymen, Dr. Willard Uphaus, the victim of persecution in New Hampshire, and Mr. David Hyun, a Korean-born but fully American architect in Southern California. What other agency is concerned with such efforts? Surely we need the Federation to continue to cry out for justice!

I do not have the time to go further into the discussion of issues which the Federation almost alone has considered during the past year. These have been dealt with in the able editorial guidance of Jack McMichael and in certain regional meetings.

When Bishop Fred Pierce Corson was an ambitious young District Superintendent under Bishop Francis J. McConnell, he placed a Federation application in my hands and urged me to join. My activity during most of my membership has consisted simply in the writing of an annual check in support of others who were carrying the responsibility. I never was really stirred into action until 1952 when I observed first-hand the unfair tactics of opponents of the Federation. I never attended a national meeting until 1953. But my soul has always reacted in any situation of injustice, and in loyalty to the principle involved and to the blessed memory of the example of my ideal churchman, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, I have made the Federation an important extra-curricular activity.

I have evidence in my possession that the Methodist "Circuit-Riders" were in collusion with a governmental agency before the 1952 General Conference to poison the minds of delegates against the Federation. The first step which I took after being elected President of the Federation was to request the Bishops to arrange for a fair investigation of the MFSA. This request was refused. This thus misled many well meaning people because of government agency interference in a private church matter and the unwillingness of proper authorities to investigate our record and position.

We appeal to fair-minded Methodist friends to join us in this struggle for religious freedom. We are opposed by politicians who would make capital by subverting the principles of the separation of church and state. We are opposed by reactionary elements in and out of the church who would curb prophetic religion.

A favorite practice of our opponents is the use of "guilt by association" and "association of ideas." For once may I point out that our reactionary opponents are taking the same position as the Communist regime in Russia. This was pointed out by the recent delegation of churchmen who visited the U.S.S.R. They reported no interference with religion as long as the message was of an other-worldly character. But anything like a social gospel is forbidden. Here we have an association of ideas in which the U.S.S.R. and the Methodist "Circuit-Riders" speak as one voice.

But we must look to the future. In 1957, the Federation will observe the 50th anniversary of its organization. That happened in the city of Washington, D. C. In the days of our greatest membership strength, we never claimed more than 5000 members. May I express the hope that again and on our 50th anniversary we shall be able to report 5000 members. It is not an impossible achievement. Let us plan carefully at this 49th annual meeting for growth. In this way we shall honor the founders who made possible the good reputation of our great Church in matters of social justice and human welfare.

CHARLES ROWOLDT DEPORTATION CASE

Occasionally the case of one man becomes more important than just the man or the injustices done to him. This is so with the deportation case of Charles Rowoldt of Minneapolis which the United States Supreme Court has just agreed to review.

When he was 30 years old, Charles Rowoldt and his wife left their native Germany because of the growing militarism there. They chose the United States of America as the land in which they would be most likely to find freedom and democracy. His wife died when they had lived in America only a few years. His only son, born in Chicago, died at the age of 12.

Until the great depression of the thirties he was seldom without a job. He worked in the factories of Chicago and Detroit. He worked as a butler. He topped sugar beets, worked the harvest fields of the Dakotas, was an itinerant salesman, a railroad worker, a hotel and restaurant worker. In 1933, he found himself unable to obtain employment. To his surprise he found that many others were in the same situation. While searching for a way out he heard of an organization called the Unemployed Council. They helped him obtain relief; he became interested in their program for unemployment insurance and social security and joined them. Later he heard of another organization that was also advocating a program for social security. This was the Communist Party. He joined that organization also.

In 1936, he was arrested in a deportation proceedings. Told by an immigration official that it was unlawful for an alien to be a communist, he dropped his membership. The deportation case was finally dismissed in 1945 and he was advised by the immigration department that he could apply for citizenship papers. But before he achieved citizenship, a new wave of hysteria developed, new anti-alien laws were passed and Charles Rowoldt was again arrested for deportation, based on the few months membership in the Communist Party in 1936. Rowoldt is now 72 years old. He has never been accused of any crime or wrong doing. Except for the deportation proceedings, he has never been in any trouble with the law.

One of the questions raised by the defense is whether the law providing for deportation of non-citizens for past membership in the Communist Party is unconstitutional. In previous decisions the majority of the Supreme Court has held that the power of Congress to deport aliens is absolute. In agreeing to review the Rowoldt case, the court has indicated a willingness to re-examine its position.

Deportation has been widely condemned as inhuman. President Truman's commission on Immigration and Nationality recommended that anyone who has been in the country 20 years should not be deported for any reason whatsoever. There are over 350 political deportation cases in which men and women face forcible lifetime separation from family and friends, without regard for the length of time they have lived in the country, solely because of past or present political affiliation. There is a statute of limitations on crimes. This is no crime, yet there is no statute of limitations on deportations. There are 125 grounds for deportation in the Walter-McCarran law.

A decision by the Supreme Court that the law providing for deportation is unconstitutional could have as great an effect on our immigration and citizenship policy as the recent decision desegregating the schools is having on Negroes.

RESOLUTIONS FROM THE 1956 MFSA CONVENTION

Continued from Page 17

lish elsewhere Jean's own statement on her case.)

(Editor's Note: The MFSA Membership Meeting adopted other resolutions, asking (1) an end to further testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons as urged also by the Pope, Presidential candidate Stevenson, and others, and (2) abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Eastland Senate Sub-committee on Internal Security—as threats to our democracy and constitutional principles. Voted also was a letter of appreciation to our Church's three official Social Action Boards for their splendid drama on social issues, "The Prodigal World," produced at General Conference and a similar letter to Rev. Dr. Martin L. King, Jr., and associates in the Montgomery Improvement Association, heroically battling bus segregation.)

BEHIND THE HEADLINES

"Goal of Freeing Satellite Lands Restated by U. S." The declaration would destroy the possibilities of ending the cold war and proceedings with disarmament opened up by the recent enlargement of the United Nations. Its objectives cannot be peacefully accomplished.

Here is government by decree instead of democratic discussion to which this nation has increasingly submitted since entered World War II. When did the Cabinet, Congress, or voters discuss "liberation?"

This policy contradicts the recent almost unanimous admission of Eastern European peoples as sovereign states. That was the first step toward peaceful coexistence. The UN is now concerned continuously with how to get along in needed world actions with these states. The liberation policy is continuously concerned with how to get rid of them. This increases world tensions, lessens UN efficiency, diminishes the likelihood of escaping the unlimited destruction of thermo-nuclear war.

In face of the UN action and the increasing internal strength of the governments concerned, testified to by capable neutral observers and capitalist press correspondents, with the same holding true for the Soviet Union and China, the call for peaceful liberation really means peaceful overthrow. This is a contradiction in terms when the native forces whom we are seeking to bring to power are recognized. Witness what has been admitted in print concerning the activities of those supported and used by the foreign secret service headed by Allen Dulles.

The impossibility of peaceful liberation is increased when the full scope of the policy is recognized. It mentions the Eastern European "Satellites" most but they are the least of the "captive peoples" it draws within its purpose. Secretary Dulles recently informed exiled leaders of "The Assembly of Captive European Nations, the U. S. will accept no acquiescence in subjugation of the satellites." The gathering included exiles from Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Each of these has been for some years a Soviet Socialist republic. Does Dulles think the Soviet Union can be peacefully dismembered?

At Geneva, the President extended the policy of peaceful liberation to "the oppressed peoples of the world." In his State of the Union message he adds "bondage of millions elsewhere." Both times he obviously means China and other parts of Asia. Considering the rate of emancipation of those peoples from the several bondages of the past does he really think that the clock can be peacefully turned back? Or for long held stationary by arming those who have long practiced force?

Impossibility of this is multiplied when we remember that the ultimate objective of "liberation" is not change in government but a reversal of change in the economic order. Basically the policy is one of economic counter revolution in the communist led countries, and the prevention of anything but capitalist economy in the industrially undeveloped lands. Millions of peasants and workers, long deprived of their due place in the system are getting more good things of life than they ever had, and they see more each year. Millions more see a way to use natural resources for their own development without paying exorbitant tribute the white man's capitalistic world always collected from other races. It is illusion to think these millions can either be persuaded, or forced, to let the exploiters come back or remain or to veto the growing abundance they see.

In his State of the Union message, the president indicates he relies upon "the pressure of world opinion" for peaceful liberation. Here is more illusion. As Bandung showed, and the last UN assembly, and the unrest throughout the so-called "free-world" of U. S. policy, world opinion is moving toward peaceful coexistence.

Climatic danger of this liberation policy is it may take the nation in the opposite direction to that most citizens desire, go, by cloaking itself in the great moral values of peace and freedom. The words are those of Lincoln, Jefferson, Jesus, the 8th century prophets, but the deeds—in South Korea and Formosa in Spain and Guatemala—carry the brand of those whom Woodrow Wilson came to know as the invisible government, Teddy Roosevelt denounced as predatory wealth, and F. D. R. fought as economic royalists. The test of ethical religion is whether we can see, and make others see, the dual nature of this policy before it is too late.

H.F.W.